

a majority vote of the whole body, the Labor men have resolved to be represented in the government: this means the disappearance of the Labor party as such. The Irish remain outside. It is difficult to say whether the outlook for Home Rule would be more or less dismal than it is if both Redmond and Carson had gone into the government. The Tories, at first opposed to coalition, will accept it as a victory when they realize the power that is put into their hands by the possession of half the Cabinet seats, and will rejoice at the prospect of imposing conscription. The Liberals are rebelliously acquiescent. They recognize, for Mr. Asquith put it to them with the utmost candor, that the choice was between coalition or defeat. There are evidences of an extraordinary complexity of influences below the surface. A strong body of Liberals, for example, would, if they could, make it impossible for either Mr. Churchill or Lord Kitchener to be in the new administration. They give two reasons: the existence between them of the personal feud, and the fact that both alike have betrayed the essential principle of Cabinet government.

There remain, I think, when all is said, two questions uppermost in the minds of reasonable Englishmen. First, how is the country to free itself from the intolerable dictatorship of Lord Northcliffe and his journals? Secondly, how will the political transformation in the midst of war affect the standing of Great Britain before the world? Lord Northcliffe is, plainly, the destroyer of the Asquith Cabinet. That is serious enough; but after all, the government was tired and stale. It had been in office for over nine years, and multitudes of people felt that not to such a government, representing one party in the state, should be entrusted the colossal responsibility of conducting a war in three continents. But what of the effect of all this upon the world? We are emerging from a political and administrative crisis more severe than any known in the history of modern England, and to observers at a distance it must seem that the country is being preyed upon, its very existence imperilled, by selfish and factious individuals and groups. But that, as all who know anything of our public life will agree, is emphatically not so. It is true that we have no liking for coalition cabinets; this generation has had no experience of one. But the fact which matters is that out of the distractions of the present there will emerge a government thoroughly national in constitution and purpose. It will be harder to run than a party team; but it will be an impressive symbol of the national solidarity.

S. K. RATCLIFFE.

London, May 21st.

## The Golden Story

IT is a current impression that there are no general laws for love. Poets have always delighted in depicting the tender passion as wayward and lawless, and even sane business men are prone to agree that love is mysterious and its problems baffling. The peculiarity of its manifestations are accentuated in every work of fiction, so that the average reader who seeks illumination is compelled to extract it from fiction with all the labor of extracting gold from quartz. That this incertitude is mistaken will be welcome news to many troubled souls. Hypercritical people may scoff at the affirmation. There is no certitude to which the sceptic or the cynic will not take captious exception. But the joyous fact remains: there are certain definite principles governing every impulse and every manifestation of love, and they need only be known to be accepted.

This profound assurance is justified by an estimable but little-known work issued in Philadelphia some fifteen years ago. The author is Miss Grace Shirley, and her production is termed "Shirley's Twentieth Century Lover's Guide of Love, Courtship and Marriage. A Complete and Reliable Handbook." Published in the same popular series as the "Fun Doctor" ("blessed are those who laugh for they shall grow fat"), Professor Hoffmann's "Tricks with Dice, Dominoes, Etc.," Doctor Ellsworth's "Key to Hypnotism" and Mme. Claire Rougemont's "National Dream Book," it is well buoyed on its way to the public. But though Miss Shirley has been widely read, she has never won full appreciation. Although deep in the finest social and amatory tradition, she has been ignored in literary and philosophic circles. For this result her subject rather than its treatment must be blamed. It is hard, in this self-conscious and sophisticated age, to find an audience which will admit its admiration for a Houdini of the human heart.

Marriage, says Miss Shirley, has been termed a LOTTERY, but it is a lottery in which only the reckless need lose. "In the category of human attributes, reason stands pre-eminent; and when once love is relegated to her control, the tyranny of the passion will be subdued, and all evil results from unwise loving will be avoided." The relegation of love to the control of reason is therefore Miss Shirley's scheme, and no one who follows it can fail to be a wiser and gayer man.

Are you in doubt as to "whom to marry"? Miss Shirley has no perplexities for you. "A drunkard, habitual or otherwise, should not be considered as a candidate for matrimony, as his appetite can only bring misery and sorrow." "It is wise, from many

points of view, to marry in your own nationality, but this is by no means an obligatory course of action." "Africans, Indians or any persons representing the so-called 'colored races' should never be considered by a Caucasian." "No set rule can be made for the union of blondes and brunettes, of large men and small women, or vice versa, but it is wise to conclude that robust men will soon tire of frail women, and that the merry nature will soon be soured by contact with the hypochondriac."

Having decided on whom to marry, the next thing is to determine the symptoms of love. These do not seem highly indicative of man's preëminent attribute, but "love is divine." "Love," avers Miss Shirley, "is entertained before it is perceived. Its approach is insidious; it fairly steals in upon the senses. A blush, a sigh, a flutter of the heart, betrays us to ourselves, or sometimes to our friends before we discover it. Suddenly we burst into snatches of song, always a ditty expressive of tender sentiments; then follows the so-called habit of 'smiling at nothing,' and our voices imperceptibly take on a sweeter cadence."

Passing fancies may, however, be mistaken for "attacks of genuine love." And then there is infatuation, mesmerism, bedevilment. "The women who allow their husbands to strike them the second time are examples of this, and, alas! no human mind can conceive of their number!" To avoid such snares, you are advised to "subject the adored one to the most rigid tests." "Spare yourself no mental anguish to determine" the adored one's worthiness. For your own part, be absolutely natural, honest and sincere. "Avoid giving a wrong impression of your character or casting the glamour of artificiality or mystery about your sentiments." "Do not marry until you are *sure* you love." And remember, "the man who asserts his love within an hour after meeting a lady is either a knave or a silly fellow."

In the intimacies of affection there is much art. "Flattery of the delicate, dainty order is a weapon in love which no lover dares discard; but the poniard loses its efficacy the moment it is blunted by sickening effusiveness." "Pet names have always been indulged in more or less by lovers, and the practice is one entirely consistent with the tender passion. Imagine an ardent lover, gazing with burning glances into the timid eyes of his innamorata, and trying to murmur in dulcet tones the harsh name of 'Caroline,' when he might say 'Carrie.' But this does not mean that one should be too offensive in tender cognomens, or that they should be made use of at unseemly times or places. Even in the writing of love letters it is hardly wise to allow the emotions to run riot with the pen;

for in love, as in all other sentiments, the element of dignity should predominate."

Extreme dignity, indeed, is one of Miss Shirley's preferences. In the home she concedes that man should be "head of the family," but the wife must help him maintain the dignity of the establishment. This minor rôle is no reflection on woman. "Woman's helpfulness, cleverness, ability and nobility are too well known to need discussion here." The perfect home is a union. "It is equally culpable in each to endeavor to undervalue the life partner; while, on the contrary, it is beautiful to behold husband and wife occupying exalted pedestals in each other's minds, one ever extolling and revering the other."

The same taste for dignity is evinced in the note on kissing. "As in all other demonstrations which proceed from a heart filled with tender emotions, kissing may be made a source of annoyance, danger, or exquisite rapture. Rudeness, coarseness and familiarity cannot but breed contempt. Always preserve the veil of modesty over the rose-hued brow of passion." "Never embrace a loved one in public, unless it be a farewell kiss or a kiss of greeting. Even these should be given with an effort at repression of the overflowing fever of the veins."

After marriage, Miss Shirley insists, there must be no lapse into indifferent familiarity. "Never enter your wife's room without first tapping on the door; show her as much respect as if she were the queen of a nation instead of the queen of your home. Never smoke in your wife's bedroom, whether she permits it or not. Never wear your hat in the house, even for an instant; you would not do so if you were in someone else's house. Never fail to be as polite to your wife as to a lady to whom you had just been introduced."

The power of love is rated high by Miss Shirley. "The drunkard, the hypochondriac, the prodigal, and even the felon, have been redeemed through the power of love." And again, "to the perfection of man, woman is necessary, for his nature is eager, insistent and insatiable; and love, constant and unvarying, is his only salvation. So, also, to the average woman man's love is a necessity. Without it she is but a leaf tossed upon the storm of desire. . . . Like beautiful flowers, the natures of both expand under the sunshine of true, loyal, undying love, and how bravely, hand in hand, they meet the storms of life and defy the winds of misery to baffle or thwart them."

From advice as to love gifts—"sensible presents should be given in preference to foolish ones"—to advice as to rejected addresses—"if possible, thank the lady for her honesty, and express regret that you have wounded her"—Miss Shirley covers

every phase of the relation between man and woman. It is a triumphant survey of every emotional possibility. "Is there any knowledge in the world," asks Mr. Bertrand Russell, "which is so

certain that no reasonable man can doubt it?" The man who asks this question has never read Grace Shirley's "Lover's Guide."

F. H.

## A Substitute for the Protocol

**I**N the end institutions survive because they are necessary. If there is no need for them, they decay and die, however much they are coddled. People must need an institution, must be willing to make sacrifices for it, before it can have vitality.

We should bear this in mind when the question arises, "Who killed the protocol?" Here was an instrument which for almost five years governed the cloak and suit industry of New York. It maintained peace, raised wages, improved the sanitary conditions of the shops, and settled thousands of disputes between manufacturers and workmen. It was lauded by men on both sides as a great step towards democracy in an industry peculiarly difficult to govern. The manufacturers are immediately responsible for the ending of this protocol. It was they who destroyed the protocol because of grievances which might have been settled by the machinery set up by the protocol. They cannot and should not escape responsibility for this action. If, however, they can prove that the protocol was unnecessary, impracticable or undesirable, if they can show that the same results can be obtained by other means, then their responsibility disappears. The real question is: What was the protocol accomplishing, and can the same results be obtained by better means?

The situation in the cloak and suit industry prior to the establishment of the protocol in September, 1910, was extremely bad. The industry was, as it still is, decentralized, the fifty thousand employees being divided up into many hundreds of little shops engaged in a desperate cut-throat competition. Wages were low, owing partly to this competition and partly to the fact that the workers were in the main recent immigrants, whose numbers were recruited by each new ship arriving at Ellis Island. Nor were these low wages steady. The industry has always been seasonal in its character, and short busy seasons have been followed by long "slack" periods, during which a large proportion of the workers were thrown out of employment. During the busy season the men were over-driven. Their hours were too long, and they worked nights and holidays. In the slack season the competition for the few available jobs resulted in still other abuses. There was no effective organization either among the manufacturers or the workmen, for the

union was merely militant and therefore ineffective as an agent of control. The union membership would increase enormously during strikes and fall to almost nothing after the strike was won or lost. The better grade of manufacturers had no possibility of controlling their less scrupulous rivals, with the result that numerous complaints arose concerning excessive work under unreasonable conditions, discrimination against union men, the irregular payment of wages, and many other evils. The sanitary conditions in the worst shops were indescribable. Cloaks were made in filthy tenement rooms, where the women and children were exploited, and even some of the more reputable manufacturers were compelled by competition to resort to similar methods of production. Much of even the most expensive clothing was let out to tenement-house sub-contractors, who manufactured cheaply because they had no rent to pay and no rules to observe. Throughout the industry competition took the form of progressive deterioration, and the sufferers from these conditions were not alone the workers and the better grade manufacturers who had to meet unfair competition, but the public, both as consumers and as citizens.

How the protocol improved these conditions is in the main well known. Many of the evil practices were immediately stopped. The protocol defined the rights and duties of both manufacturers and workers, and established a system of mediation and arbitration for the settlement of all disputes. When a question arose between the workmen and a manufacturer, the matter was first discussed between the shop-chairman—appointed by the men—and the employer, and in innumerable cases was adjusted then and there. If the dispute could not be so settled, it was taken up by specially trained investigators, called "clerks," who in the vast majority of cases reached an amicable decision. There were, however, courts of still higher instance for use in cases of disagreement among the clerks. Appeal might be had to the decision of an impartial chairman and from him to the full Board of Arbitration, representing the union, the Manufacturers' Association and the public. A Joint Board of Sanitary Control, representing both sides and the public, was also created, and this board was successful not only in ending the execrable sanitary